

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

---

|                           |   |                         |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| TONY LAMAR EATON #185177, | ) |                         |
|                           | ) |                         |
| Plaintiff,                | ) | Case No. 2:06-cv-16     |
|                           | ) |                         |
| v.                        | ) | HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL |
|                           | ) |                         |
| MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT       | ) |                         |
| OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,   | ) |                         |
|                           | ) |                         |
| Defendants.               | ) | <b><u>OPINION</u></b>   |
|                           | ) |                         |

---

This is a civil rights action brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, PUB. L. No. 104-134, 110 STAT. 1321 (1996) (“PLRA”), “no action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions . . . until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.” 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). Because Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate exhaustion of available administrative remedies, the Court will dismiss his complaint without prejudice.

**Discussion**

I. **Factual allegations**

Plaintiff is presently incarcerated at the Alger Maximum Correctional Facility (LMF). In his *pro se* complaint, he sues Defendants Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC), Resident Unit Officer Unknown Miron, Warden David Bergh, Sergeant Unknown Hurst, Resident Unit Officer Unknown Irvine, Resident Unit Officer Unknown Tweedale, and Resident Unit Officer Unknown Kurth.

Plaintiff claims that Defendants Miron, Hurst, Irvine, and Tweedale allowed another prisoner, Larry McGee #192103, to assault Plaintiff and prisoner Stockenauer with feces. Inmate McGee stated that the assault was “a hit,” and that he had been paid cigarettes to do the hit by Defendant Miron and Resident Unit Officers Sharrett and Holman. Plaintiff further states that prisoner McGee is H.I.V. positive and is dying. Plaintiff claims that the assault was in retaliation for prisoner Stockenauer filing lawsuits and that Plaintiff was also attacked because he had been talking to Stockenauer. Plaintiff states that the other Defendants allowed the assault to occur and failed to protect Plaintiff. For relief, Plaintiff requests damages and equitable relief.

II. Lack of exhaustion of available administrative remedies

Plaintiff has failed to sufficiently allege and show exhaustion of available administrative remedies. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), a prisoner bringing an action with respect to prison conditions under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 must exhaust available administrative remedies. *See Porter v. Nussle*, 534 U.S. 516 (2002); *Booth v. Churner*, 532 U.S. 731 (2001). The exhaustion requirement is mandatory and applies to all suits regarding prison conditions, regardless of the nature of the wrong or the type of relief sought. *Porter*, 534 U.S. at 516; *Booth*, 532 U.S. at 741. A district court must enforce the exhaustion requirement *sua sponte*. *Brown v. Toombs*, 139 F.3d 1102, 1104 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 525 U.S. 833, 119 S. Ct. 88 (1998); *accord Wyatt v. Leonard*, 193 F.3d 876, 879 (6th Cir. 1999).

A prisoner must allege and show that he has exhausted all available administrative remedies and should attach to his § 1983 complaint the administrative decision disposing of his complaint, if the decision is available. *Brown*, 139 F.3d at 1104. In the absence of written documentation, the prisoner must describe with specificity the administrative proceeding and its

outcome so that the court may determine what claims, if any, have been exhausted. *Knuckles El v. Toombs*, 215 F.3d 640, 642 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 1040, 121 S. Ct. 634 (2000). A prisoner must specifically mention the involved parties in the grievance to make prison officials aware of the problems so that the prison has a chance to address the claims before they reach federal court. *Curry v. Scott*, 249 F.3d 493, 505 (6th Cir. 2001).

Plaintiff's claim regarding the failure to protect him from an assault is the type of claim that may be grieved. *See* MICH. DEP'T OF CORR., Policy Directive 03.02.130, ¶ E (may grieve "alleged violations of policy and procedure or unsatisfactory conditions of confinement") (effective Nov. 1, 2000); ¶ II (may grieve brutality and corruption by prison staff) (effective Oct. 11, 1999 and November 1, 2000).

The burden to allege and show exhaustion belongs to Plaintiff. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a); *Knuckles El*, 215 F.3d at 642; *Brown*, 139 F.3d at 1104. This requirement is "so that the district court may intelligently decide if the issues raised can be decided on the merits." *Knuckles El*, 215 F.3d at 642. Plaintiff attaches a copy of grievance number LMF-05-11-3908-17z to his complaint. However, a review of the step I grievance shows that Plaintiff did not name any of the Defendants in his grievance. Moreover, Plaintiff claims that because he did not receive a step I response, he did not file a step II grievance, and instead filed a step III grievance. However, Plaintiff clearly did not follow MDOC policy in this regard, as a grievant who does not receive a timely Step I response, may appeal to Step II within five business days after the date the response was due. MICH. DEP'T OF CORR., Policy Directive 03.02.130, ¶ CC (effective 4/28/03). Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate exhaustion of available administrative remedies.

It is not clear whether Plaintiff may still grieve his claims. Under the policy of the prison, complaints must be resolved expeditiously, and complaints may be rejected as untimely. *See* Policy Directive 03.02.130, ¶¶ G-3, T, V. The Sixth Circuit held that an inmate cannot claim that “he has exhausted his remedies or that it is futile for him to do so because his grievance is now time-barred under the regulations.” *Hartsfield v. Vidor*, 199 F.3d 305, 309 (6th Cir. 1999) (citing *Wright v. Morris*, 111 F.3d 414, 417 n.3 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 522 U.S. 906 (1997)).

Because the exhaustion requirement is no longer discretionary, but is mandatory, the Court does not have the discretion to provide a continuance in the absence of exhaustion. *See* *Wright*, 111 F.3d at 417. Rather, dismissal of this action without prejudice is appropriate when a prisoner has failed to show that he exhausted available administrative remedies. *See Freeman*, 196 F.3d at 645; *Brown*, 139 F.3d at 1104; *White v. McGinnis*, 131 F.3d 593, 595 (6th Cir. 1997); *Bradford v. Moore*, No. 97-1909, 1998 WL 476206, at \*1 (6th Cir. Aug. 3, 1998). Dismissal for failing to exhaust available administrative remedies does not relieve a plaintiff from payment of the civil action filing fee. *Omar v. Lesza*, No. 97 C 5817, 1997 WL 534361, at \*1 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 26, 1997). Accordingly, the Court will dismiss his action without prejudice.

### Conclusion

Having conducted the review now required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act, the Court will dismiss Plaintiff’s action without prejudice because he has failed to show exhaustion as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a).

The Court must next decide whether an appeal of this action would be in good faith within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997). For the same reasons that the Court dismisses the action, the Court discerns no

good-faith basis for an appeal. Should Plaintiff appeal this decision, the Court will assess the \$255 appellate filing fee pursuant to § 1915(b)(1), *see McGore*, 114 F.3d at 610-11, unless Plaintiff is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis*, e.g., by the “three-strikes” rule of § 1915(g). If he is barred, he will be required to pay the \$255 appellate filing fee in one lump sum.

A Judgment consistent with this Opinion will be entered.

Date: February 13, 2006

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell  
ROBERT HOLMES BELL  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE